



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/077,407

02/15/2002

Jay Jayapalan

CE08888R

3259

22917

7590

09/15/2006

MOTOROLA, INC.
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD
IL01/3RD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER

BHATIA, AJAY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2145

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/077,407

Applicant(s)

JAYAPALAN ET AL.

Examiner

Ajay M. Bhatia

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/6/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's representative is arguing that BS/MSC, is not a proxy server, examiner did not state this. Examiner has provided to references for interpretation of the term, proxy. Proxy is a "server that returns the page to the requesting client", this interpretation does not appear to correspond to applicant use of the term, since no page is being requested. Therefore examiner is using the alternative definition of proxy as a "go between." If applicant reviews Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, the system of Lioy the MT2 system prevent the system from having duplicate negotiations. Applicant remarks addressing claims 9, 15, 19 and 20 are directed to the same issues addressed in the above argument. Therefore applicant arguments fail to persuade the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 8 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession

Art Unit: 2145

of the claimed invention. Tangible is not defined in the specification, applicant is suggested to amend claim to limitation supported by the specification.

Applicant is suggested to review the interim guidelines in the Official Gazette Notices dated 22 November 2005, under Guidelines for Subject Matter Eligibility.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liroy (U.S. Patent 6,775,553).

For claim 1, Liroy teaches, in a communication system comprising at least two peers that communicate with each other across an intermediate network comprising at least one infrastructure element, a method for an infrastructure element of the at least one infrastructure element to establish communications between two peers of the at least two peers, the method comprising:

monitoring at least a portion of messages exchanged between the two peers for control messages;

storing at least some parameters corresponding to the control messages exchanged between the two peers to provide stored parameters;

detecting occurrence of retransmission of a control message from one of the two peers, wherein the retransmission of the control message will lead to duplicate negotiations between the two peers; and

processing the retransmission of the control message based on the stored parameters such that the duplicate negotiations are avoided between the two peers.
(Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30)

Lioy fails to clearly disclose, and sending a valid proxy response

Proxy server is compatible with Lioy because Lioy allows for a switching system in Col. 1 line 50 in addition Lioy discusses messages are sent back to prevent duplicate negotiations

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine sending a valid proxy response and with the system of Lioy, because presently the system is preventing duplicate negotiations via the MT2 device. (Lioy Col. 1 line 50, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30)

Art Unit: 2145

For claim 2, Lioy teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the control messages comprise point-to-point protocol control messages. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, IPCP is a PPP)

For claim 3, Lioy teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the communication system comprises a wireless communication system, the at least two peers comprising at least one wireless communication unit in communication with at least one interworking unit via the intermediate network, and wherein the control message is sent from a wireless communication unit of the at least one wireless communication unit. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1)

For claim 4, Lioy teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the communication system comprises a wireless communication system, the at least two peers comprising at least one wireless communication unit in communication with at least one interworking unit via the intermediate network, and wherein the control message is sent from an interworking unit of the at least one interworking unit. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1)

For claim 5, Lioy teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein processing of the retransmission of the control message further comprises discarding the retransmission of the control message. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 3A)

For claim 6, Lioy teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein processing of the retransmission of the control message further comprises generation of a valid proxy response based on the stored parameters. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Col. 6 lines 37-52, Figure 3A) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 6.

For claim 7, Lioy teaches, the method claim 1, further comprising, prior to detecting the retransmission of the control message:

- detecting transmission of data by each of the two peers; and
- discarding the stored parameters in response to detecting the transmission of data by each of the two peers. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1)

For claim 8, Lioy teaches, a machine-readable medium having stored thereon machine-executable instructions for carrying out the method of claim 1. (Lioy, Col. 5 lines 38-54)

For claim 9. In a communication system comprising at least two peers that communicate with each other across an intermediate network comprising at least one infrastructure element, a method for an infrastructure element of the at least one infrastructure element to establish communications between a first peer and a second peer of the at least two peers, the method comprising:

- receiving, from the first peer, a request control message targeted to the second peer;

storing parameters from the request control message to provide stored request control message parameters;

forwarding the request control message to the second peer;

receiving, from the first peer, a retransmission of the request control message targeted to the second peer; and

processing the retransmission of the request control message and sending a valid proxy response based on the stored request control message parameters. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 9.

For claim 10, Lioy teaches, the method of claim 9, wherein the request control message and the retransmission of the request control message comprise point-to-point protocol control messages. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1, IPCP is a PPP)

For claim 11, Lioy teaches, the method of claim 9, wherein processing of the retransmission of the control message further comprises discarding the retransmission of the control message. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 3A)

For claim 12, Lioy teaches, the method of claim 9, wherein processing of the retransmission of the control message further comprises generation of a valid proxy response based on the stored request control message parameters. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62

Art Unit: 2145

to Col. 6 line 30, Col. Col. 6 lines 37-52, Figure 3A) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 12.

For claim 13, Liroy teaches, the method of claim 9, further comprising, prior to receiving the retransmission of the first request control message:

detecting transmission of data by each of the first peer and the second peer; and
discarding the stored request control message parameters in response to
detecting the transmission of data by the first peer and the second peer. (Liroy, Col. 5
line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1)

For claim 14, Liroy teaches, a machine-readable medium having stored thereon machine-executable instructions for carrying out the method of claim 9. (Liroy, Col. 5
lines 38-54)

For claim 15, Liroy teaches, an apparatus for use in an intermediate network forming a part of a communication system, the communication system comprising at least two peers that communicate with each other across the intermediate network, the apparatus comprising:

at least one processor; and
at least one storage device, coupled to the at least one processor, having stored thereon instructions that, when executed by the at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to:

monitor at least a portion of messages exchanged between two peers of the at least two peers for control messages;

store, in the at least one storage device, at least some parameters corresponding to the control messages exchanged between the two peers to provide stored parameters;

detect occurrence of retransmission of a control message from one of the two peers, wherein the retransmission of the control message will lead to duplicate negotiations between the two peers; and

process the retransmission of the control message and sending a valid proxy response based on the stored parameters such that the duplicate negotiations are avoided between two peers. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15.

For claim 16, Lioy teaches, the apparatus of claim 15, wherein the control messages comprise point-to-point protocol control messages. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1, IPCP is a PPP)

For claim 17, Lioy teaches, the apparatus of claim 15, wherein the at least one storage device further comprises instructions that, when executed by the at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to:

process the retransmission of the control message by discarding the retransmission of the control message. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 3A)

For claim 18, Lioy teaches, the apparatus of claim 15, wherein the at least one storage device further comprises instructions that, when executed by the at least one processor, cause the at least one processor to:

process the retransmission of the control message by generating a valid proxy response based on the store parameters. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Col. 6 lines 37-52, Figure 3A) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 18.

For claim 19, Lioy teaches, a base station controller embodying the apparatus of claim 15. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1, object 106)

For claim 20, Lioy teaches, a mobile switching center embodying the apparatus of claim 15. (Lioy, Col. 5 line 62 to Col. 6 line 30, Figure 1, object 104)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached USPTO 892 (if appropriate).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M. Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



AB



Jason Cardone
Supervisor Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145